

REMARKS

The Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed March 14, 2008 and offer the following remarks to accompany the above amendments.

Claims 1-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0145054 A1 to *Dyke* (hereinafter "*Dyke*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Prior to addressing the rejection, the Applicants provide herewith a brief summary of an embodiment of the present invention. In one embodiment, the present invention allows a communication client to receive a session request from a sending communication client, wherein the session request includes additional information. The additional information is processed to determine an action to take in association with the communication session to be established with the communication client. The actions to be taken may include providing information to a user, displaying information to a user, recording at least a portion of the communication session, storing information related to the communication session, initiating other sessions with other communication devices, restricting incoming session requests to those related to the existing communication session, obtaining information from a participant in the session, providing information to a participant in the session, accessing web sites, initiating emails, calls, or instant messages, and the like. Accordingly, information may be provided in session requests to cause the communication client receiving the session request to establish the session, as well as take additional actions unrelated to the establishment of the communication session. The Applicants submit that *Dyke* does not disclose receiving a session request having information necessary to establish a communication session along with additional information, where the additional information is different from the information necessary to establish the communication session, such as accessing a website, initiating emails, initiating instant messages, or the like.

Now turning to the rejection, according to Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicants submit that *Dyke* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-42. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method comprising, among other features, receiving a session request, which includes information necessary to establish a communication session and additional information, where the additional information "is different from the information necessary to establish the communication session." Claim 22 has been amended to

include similar features. The Applicants submit that *Dyke* does not disclose receiving a session request having information necessary to establish a communication session along with additional information, which is different from the information necessary to establish the communication session.

Dyke discloses that a Participant 1 sends a SIP request to a control agent in order to join a conference call with a media server.¹ Moreover, *Dyke* only discloses that the SIP request includes a public conference Universal Resource Identifier (URI), which indicates which conference call the Participant 1 would like to join.² Thus, *Dyke* only discloses that when the Participant 1 sends a request to initiate a communication session, i.e., a conference call, additional information related to and part of the conference call, i.e., a URI, is also sent. Nonetheless, *Dyke* does not disclose that the SIP request includes information, which is different from and unrelated to the establishment of the conference call, such as information relating to accessing a website, initiating emails, initiating instant messages, or the like. Therefore, claims 1 and 22 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-17, 20, 21, 23-38, 41, and 42, which ultimately depend from either claim 1 or 22, are patentable for at least the same reasons along with the novel features recited therein.

Claim 18, which ultimately depends from claim 1, recites that “the action comprises accessing a web site,” where the action is based on additional information in a session request. Claim 39, which ultimately depends from claim 22, includes similar features. The Applicants submit that *Dyke* does not disclose that an action comprises accessing a web site, where the action is based on additional information in a session request. The Patent Office supports the rejection by stating that *Dyke* discloses this feature in paragraph [0020].³ The Applicants respectfully disagree. At most, the cited portion of *Dyke* discloses that a computer network 101 may contain the Internet.⁴ However, no mention is made about accessing a web site, much less an action, which includes accessing a website where the action is based on additional information in a session request. For this reason and the reasons noted above with reference to

¹ See *Dyke*, Figure 2 and paragraph [0028].

² See *Dyke*, Figure 2 and paragraph [0028].

³ See Office Action mailed March 14, 2008, page 6.

⁴ See *Dyke*, paragraph [0020].

claims 1 and 22, claims 18 and 39 are patentable over the cited reference and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 19, which ultimately depends from claim 1, recites that “the action comprises providing an email or instant message,” where the action is based on additional information in a session request. Claim 40, which ultimately depends from claim 22, includes similar features. The Applicants submit that *Dyke* does not disclose that an action comprises providing an email or an instant message, where the action is based on additional information in a session request. The Patent Office supports the rejection by stating that *Dyke* discloses this feature in paragraph [0020].⁵ The Applicants respectfully disagree. At most, as previously detailed, the cited portion of *Dyke* discloses that a computer network 101 may contain the Internet. However, the cited portion does not disclose that an action comprises providing an email, where the action is based on additional information in a session request. Similarly, *Dyke* does not disclose that an action comprises providing an instant message, where the action is based on additional information in a session request. In addition to the reasons noted above with respect to claims 1 and 22, claims 19 and 40 are patentable over *Dyke* and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Applicants have also added new claims 43 and 44, which respectively depend from claims 1 and 22. No new matter has been added by this amendment. The Applicants submit that new claims 43 and 44 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 22 along with the novel features recited therein.

The present application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicants’ representative regarding any remaining issues in an effort to expedite allowance and issuance of the present application.

⁵ See Office Action mailed March 14, 2008, page 6.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:



Anthony J. Josephson

Registration No. 45,742

100 Regency Forest Drive, Suite 160

Cary, NC 27518

Telephone: (919) 238-2300

Date: June 16, 2008

Attorney Docket: 7000-334